Impact of Genetic Factors on the Development and Progression of Pediatric Diseases

Ahmed Abdelsamie Fadl[1], Aamal AbdulGhani Hejab[2], Zainab Abduljalil A Almansuor[3], Abdulrahman T Alharbi[4], Raghad Mohammed K Alnafie[5], Fatimah Riyadh Al Hejji[6], Dhiyaa Mohammed Aleid[7], Alraddadi Amjad Sulaiman J[8], Alatawi Asma Mohammed S[9], Saffia Mohammed Saeed Gibriel[10], Sarah Basheer Al Ahmed[11]

[1] Pediatric Consultant, Pediatric Senior Registrar, Doctor Samir Abbas Hospital, Department of Pediatrics, Alazhar University Hospitals, Cairo, Egypt, SCFHS Number: 12JM0036858, Email: Dr_fadl844@yahoo.com
[2] Pediatric NICU, Salmaniya Medical Complex, Aamal AbdulGhani Hejab, Bahrain Amalabdu@Hotmail.Com
[3] General Doctor, King Faisal General Hospital, Zainab Abduljalil A Almansuor, KSA, Email: al-mansoor1930@hotmail.com
[4] Pediatrics, Adan Hospital, Ministry of Health in Kuwait, Abdulrahman T Alharbi, Kuwait, Email: abdulrahmantmharbi@gmail.com
[5] Nurse, Yanbu General Hospital, Yanbu, Saudi Arabia, Raghad Mohammed K Alnafi, Saudi Arabia, Email: raghd.alnafei@gmail.com
[6] Medical Student, Almaarefa University, Fatimah Riyadh Al Hejji, Saudi Arabia, Email: fatimah.rm266@gmail.com
[7] General Practitioner (GP), MOH Alahsa, Dhiyaa Mohammed Aleid, Saudi Arabia, Email: dhiyaa-20@hotmail.com
[8] General Practitioner (GP), Dr. Nizar Ibrahim Complex, Alraddadi Amjad Sulaiman J, KSA , Email: dr.amjaads@hotmail.com
[9] General Practitioner (GP), Dupa Hospital, Tabuk, Alatawi Asma Mohammed S, KSA, Email: asmalatawi@moh.gov.sa
[10] Pediatric, Maternity and Children Hospital Hafer Albatin (MCH Hafer Albatin), Saffia Mohammed Saeed Gibriel, KSA, Email: safiasaeed2525@gmail.com
[11] Master's in Respiratory Therapy, Lecturer, Inaya Medical College, Riyadh, Sarah Basheer Al Ahmed, KSA, Email: sara_3basheer@hotmail.com

***Corresponding author: Ahmed Abdelsamie Fadl**, **Email:** Dr_fadl844@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Objective: This review aims to synthesize the current scientific understanding of the multifaceted impact of genetic factors on the etiology, progression, and clinical management of pediatric diseases. It explores the spectrum of genetic contributions, from monogenic to multifactorial disorders, and discusses the emerging roles of epigenetics and genomic technologies in reshaping pediatric care.

Methods: A comprehensive literature review was conducted, analyzing peer-reviewed publications and clinical guidelines from databases including PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science. The review critically examines evidence from genome-wide association studies (GWAS), clinical sequencing data, epigenetic analyses, and ethical frameworks governing genetic testing in children.

Results: Genetic factors constitute a fundamental determinant of pediatric health, underpinning a significant proportion of childhood morbidity and mortality. Monogenic disorders, while individually rare, collectively impose a substantial burden and provide clear genotype-phenotype correlations, though often modified by other factors. For common multifactorial diseases like asthma, type 1 diabetes, and obesity, polygenic risk scores reveal a complex interplay between numerous genetic susceptibility loci and environmental triggers. Furthermore, epigenetic mechanisms are identified as critical mediators of developmental programming, explaining how early-life exposures can confer long-term disease risk. The integration of advanced genetic testing into clinical practice has dramatically improved diagnostic yields but introduces significant ethical considerations regarding consent, incidental findings, and data interpretation, necessitating expert genetic counseling.

Conclusion: The integration of genetics and genomics is fundamental to a modern understanding of pediatric disease. Moving beyond a simple Mendelian model to embrace polygenic risk, epigenetic regulation, and gene-environment interactions is essential for accurate diagnosis, prognostication, and personalized management. The future of pediatrics lies in leveraging this genetic knowledge to develop proactive, preventive strategies and targeted therapies, all while adhering to a robust ethical framework that protects the welfare of the child and family.

Keywords: Pediatric Genetics, Monogenic Disorders, Polygenic Risk, Epigenetics, Genome-Wide Association Study (GWAS), Genetic Testing, Genetic Counseling.

Received: 26/10/2025
Accepted: 27/11/2025

INTRODUCTION

The landscape of pediatric medicine has been fundamentally reshaped by the monumental advances in human genetics over the past two decades. Historically, the etiology of childhood diseases was often partitioned into distinct categories of congenital malformations, infectious agents, and environmental insults[1]. However, the completion of the Human Genome Project and the subsequent proliferation of high-throughput genomic technologies have unveiled a far more complex and intricate reality: genetic factors serve as a critical cornerstone in the susceptibility, pathogenesis, and clinical heterogeneity of a vast spectrum of pediatric disorders.[1]

From classic monogenic diseases to complex multifactorial conditions, the individual's genomic blueprint is now understood to be a primary determinant of health and disease from the earliest stages of life.

The burden of genetic disease in the pediatric population is profound. It is estimated that genetic disorders account for a significant proportion of infant mortality, chronic childhood illness, and developmental disabilities.[2] Major congenital anomalies, which are frequently underpinned by genetic or genomic alterations, affect approximately 3-5% of live births.[3] Furthermore, the onset of many chronic non-communicable diseases of childhood, including certain forms of cancer, autoimmune conditions, and metabolic syndromes, has a strong heritable component. The elucidation of these genetic underpinnings is not merely an academic exercise; it is a clinical imperative for improving patient outcomes through precise diagnosis, informed prognostic stratification, and the burgeoning field of targeted, personalized therapeutics.

The genetic architecture influencing pediatric diseases is remarkably diverse, spanning a continuum from highly penetrant single-gene mutations to the collective contribution of numerous common variants. At one end of this spectrum lie rare, monogenic disorders, such as cystic fibrosis (caused by mutations in the *CFTR* gene) [4] and Duchenne muscular dystrophy (resulting from pathogenic variants in the *DMD* gene).[5] These conditions, while individually uncommon, collectively represent a substantial cause of morbidity and mortality and have served as paradigmatic models for understanding genotype-phenotype correlations. The advent of clinical exome and genome sequencing has dramatically accelerated the diagnosis of such Mendelian conditions, ending the diagnostic odyssey for many families and enabling accurate recurrence risk counseling.[6]

Simultaneously, it is now unequivocal that many common pediatric diseases—including type 1 diabetes, asthma, autism spectrum disorder, and pediatric-onset inflammatory bowel disease—are polygenic in nature.[7] These conditions arise from a complex interplay between an individual's unique combination of common and rare genetic variants (each conferring a small to moderate degree of risk) and triggering environmental factors. Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have been instrumental in identifying thousands of susceptibility loci for these complex traits, providing invaluable insights into their biological pathways and pathophysiological mechanisms.[8]

Beyond inherited variation, the role of *de novo* mutations and somatic mosaicism has emerged as a pivotal factor in severe neurodevelopmental disorders like autism and intellectual disability, as well as in many pediatric cancers.[9] These spontaneous genetic alterations, which are not present in the parents' genomes, can arise in germ cells or during early embryonic development, creating a genetic landscape unique to the affected child and explaining sporadic cases of otherwise rare diseases. This review article aims to synthesize the current state of knowledge regarding the impact of genetic factors on the development and progression of pediatric diseases.

Inheritance Patterns and Clinical Implications

Mendelian disorders, resulting from mutations in a single gene, represent a cornerstone of pediatric genetics. While individually rare, their collective prevalence is significant, affecting an estimated 1 in 200 live births and contributing substantially to childhood mortality, chronic illness, and long-term disability.[2]

These disorders follow predictable patterns of inheritance—autosomal dominant, autosomal recessive, X-linked dominant, and X-linked recessive—as originally described by Gregor Mendel. The identification of the specific molecular lesion responsible for a Mendelian condition provides an unparalleled opportunity for understanding fundamental biological pathways, establishing a definitive diagnosis, and offering accurate genetic counseling regarding recurrence risks. The clinical presentation of these disorders in childhood is often severe and distinctive, making their recognition a critical component of pediatric care.

Autosomal recessive disorders manifest only when an individual carries pathogenic variants in both alleles of a gene. This inheritance pattern has profound implications for family planning and population health. Affected children are typically born to asymptomatic parents who are heterozygous carriers, conferring a 25% recurrence risk with each pregnancy.

- **Cystic Fibrosis (CF):** Cystic fibrosis stands as a classic example of an autosomal recessive disorder, primarily caused by mutations in the *CFTR* gene on chromosome 7.[4] The *CFTR* gene encodes a chloride channel critical for maintaining fluid homeostasis on

epithelial surfaces. The most common mutation, F508del, is a three-base-pair deletion resulting in a misfolded protein that is degraded before reaching the cell membrane. This leads to the production of thick, sticky mucus in the lungs, pancreas, liver, and other organs. The clinical phenotype is predominantly characterized by progressive obstructive lung disease, pancreatic insufficiency leading to malabsorption and failure to thrive, and elevated sweat chloride levels.[4],[10]

- **Phenotypic Variability in CF:** Despite its monogenic nature, CF exhibits considerable phenotypic variability. While the F508del homozygous state is generally associated with a severe classic phenotype, children carrying other mutations, such as R117H, may present with a milder, atypical disease characterized by pancreatic sufficiency and later diagnosis.[10] This variability is influenced by the specific combination of *CFTR* mutations (in trans), the function of modifier genes elsewhere in the genome, and environmental factors. This underscores the principle that even within a single-gene disorder, the genotype does not unilaterally dictate the phenotype.
- **Sickle Cell Disease:** Another profound example is sickle cell disease, an autosomal recessive hemoglobinopathy caused by a specific point mutation (GAG → GTG) in the *HBB* gene on chromosome 11, leading to the substitution of valine for glutamic acid in the β-globin chain (HbS).[11] The polymerization of deoxygenated HbS distorts red blood cells into a characteristic sickle shape, resulting in chronic hemolytic anemia, vaso-occlusive painful crises, and progressive multi-organ damage. The near-complete correlation between the homozygous HbS genotype and the disease phenotype makes it a textbook model. However, the clinical course can be modified by co-inheritance of other genetic factors, such as hereditary persistence of fetal hemoglobin (HPFH), where elevated levels of fetal hemoglobin (HbF) can ameliorate the severity of the disease.[11]

Autosomal dominant disorders are expressed in a heterozygous state, where a single mutated allele is sufficient to cause the disease. The recurrence risk for an affected individual to pass the mutation to their offspring is 50%. Many dominant disorders present with variable expressivity and reduced penetrance, adding layers of complexity to their diagnosis and management.

- **Neurofibromatosis Type 1 (NF1):** NF1, caused by mutations in the *NF1* tumor suppressor gene on chromosome 17, is a classic autosomal dominant condition with complete penetrance but remarkably variable expressivity.[12] The diagnosis is clinical, based on criteria including café-au-lait macules, axillary freckling, Lisch nodules, and neurofibromas. The clinical spectrum ranges from mild manifestations with only cutaneous signs to severe complications including plexiform neurofibromas, optic pathway gliomas, skeletal dysplasia, and malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumors. This dramatic phenotypic variability is partly attributed to the specific nature of the *NF1*mutation, the effect of modifier genes, and stochastic events.[12] The challenge in pediatric management lies in predicting which children will develop the more severe complications of the disease.
- **Marfan Syndrome:** Marfan syndrome, resulting from mutations in the *FBN1* gene encoding fibrillin-1, is an autosomal dominant disorder of connective tissue.[13] The clinical implications are life-threatening, primarily due to progressive dilatation of the aortic root, which can lead to aortic dissection and rupture. Other features include ectopia lentis, skeletal overgrowth (e.g., pectus deformity, scoliosis, and arachnodactyly), and dural ectasia. Genotype-phenotype correlations have begun to emerge; for instance, mutations in exons 24-32 are associated with a higher risk of severe cardiovascular manifestations in infancy (neonatal Marfan syndrome).[13] The identification of the causative *FBN1* mutation in a proband allows for targeted monitoring and prophylactic interventions, such as beta-blocker therapy and elective aortic surgery, which have significantly improved life expectancy.

X-linked disorders are caused by mutations in genes on the X chromosome. They display a characteristic inheritance pattern that differs between males and females due to X-chromosome inactivation in females.

- **X-Linked Recessive:** Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy (DMD) is one of the most common and severe X-linked recessive disorders. It is caused by mutations (primarily deletions) in the *DMD*gene, which encodes the dystrophin protein.[5] Affected males present in early childhood with progressive proximal muscle weakness, pseudohypertrophy of the calves, markedly elevated creatine kinase levels, and loss of ambition typically by adolescence, culminating in premature death due to cardiorespiratory failure. Female carriers are usually asymptomatic but may manifest mild symptoms (manifesting carriers) due to skewed X-inactivation.[5] The correlation between the type of *DMD* mutation and the clinical phenotype is well-established; mutations that disrupt the reading frame typically result in the complete absence of dystrophin and the

severe Duchenne phenotype, whereas in-frame mutations often allow for the production of a partially functional dystrophin and are associated with the milder Becker muscular dystrophy (BMD).[5],[14]

- **X-Linked Dominant:** Rett syndrome provides a striking example of an X-linked dominant disorder that is almost exclusively observed in females. It is primarily caused by mutations in the *MECP2*gene.[9] The disorder is usually lethal in hemizygous males. In females, after a period of normal development, a regression phase occurs, characterized by loss of purposeful hand skills and spoken language, development of stereotypic hand movements, gait abnormalities, and seizures. The phenotypic spectrum in females can be broad, influenced by the specific *MECP2* mutation and the pattern of X-chromosome inactivation in the brain.[9]

A significant proportion of Mendelian disorders, particularly those with severe phenotypes that reduce reproductive fitness, arise from *de novo* mutations. These are new mutations present in the child but absent in both parents' genomes.[9]

- **Achondroplasia,** the most common form of disproportionate short stature, is almost always caused by a specific *de novo* mutation (c.1138G>A, p.Gly380Arg) in the *FGFR3* gene. This gain-of-function mutation constitutively inhibits chondrocyte proliferation in the growth plate. The high paternal age effect observed in *de novo FGFR3* mutations highlights one mechanism for their occurrence.[15]
- **Genomic Imprinting Disorders** represent a special subclass where the phenotypic expression of a gene depends on its parental origin. This epigenetic regulation is violated in disorders such as Prader-Willi syndrome (PWS) and Angelman syndrome (AS), both mapping to the same critical region on chromosome 15q11-q13. PWS, characterized by neonatal hypotonia, hyperphagia, obesity, and developmental delay, occurs when the paternally inherited copy of this region is missing or mutated. In contrast, AS, featuring severe developmental delay, ataxia, a happy demeanor, and seizures, results from the loss of the maternally inherited region.[16] These disorders demonstrate that not only the DNA sequence but also its epigenetic marks are crucial for normal development, and their disruption leads to profound, distinct pediatric syndromes.

Genetic Contributions to Multifactorial Diseases in Pediatrics

While Mendelian disorders provide a clear model of single-gene causation, the majority of common pediatric diseases do not follow simple inheritance patterns. Conditions such as asthma, type 1 diabetes (T1D), obesity, and inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) are recognized as multifactorial or complex traits. Their etiology arises from the intricate interplay between a multitude of genetic susceptibility factors and a permissive or triggering environment.[16] The genetic component in these diseases is polygenic, meaning that an individual's risk is shaped by the cumulative effect of numerous common DNA variants, each conferring a small to moderate increase in disease susceptibility. The transition to understanding this polygenic architecture, largely enabled by genome-wide association studies (GWAS), has fundamentally altered our approach to predicting, preventing, and managing the most prevalent non-communicable diseases of childhood.[7],[17]

The primary tool for dissecting the genetic underpinnings of multifactorial diseases has been the GWAS. This approach involves genotyping hundreds of thousands to millions of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) across the genomes of large cohorts of patients and controls to identify genetic variants that are statistically more frequent in those with the disease.[8]

The success of GWAS is predicated on the "common disease-common variant" hypothesis. These studies have identified thousands of susceptibility loci for pediatric-onset complex diseases. Crucially, the identified SNPs are often not the causal variants themselves but are in linkage disequilibrium with the true functional mutations. The biological insights gained are profound; the mapped loci frequently implicate specific immune pathways, metabolic processes, or epithelial barrier functions, providing a roadmap for understanding disease pathogenesis.[7] For instance, GWAS for pediatric autoimmune diseases have consistently highlighted genes involved in T-cell activation and immune tolerance, redirecting research efforts toward specific biological mechanisms.

Asthma: A Prototype of Gene-Environment Interplay in Childhood

Asthma is the most common chronic respiratory disease in children, characterized by airway inflammation, bronchial hyperresponsiveness, and reversible airflow obstruction. Its heritability is estimated at 35-70%, but its expression is powerfully modified by environmental exposures.

- **Genetic Risk Factors:** Large-scale GWAS meta-analyses have identified over 100 genetic loci associated with asthma risk.[18] Many of these loci are located in or near genes with clear roles in immune system regulation and lung function. Key examples include:
  - The *ORMDL3/GSDMB* locus on chromosome 17q21: This is one of the most consistently

replicated genetic associations with childhood-onset asthma. The genes in this region are involved in sphingolipid metabolism, immune cell function, and epithelial integrity.[18]
    - The *IL33* and *IL1RL1* (receptor for IL-33) genes: These findings strongly implicate the IL-33/ST2 pathway in Th2-mediated inflammation, a central pathway in allergic asthma.
    - The *TSLP* (Thymic Stromal Lymphopoietin) gene: TSLP is an epithelial-derived cytokine that initiates allergic inflammation, and genetic variants in its promoter region influence its expression and asthma susceptibility.

- **Gene-Environment Interplay:** The genetic predisposition to asthma is profoundly activated or modulated by environmental factors. The most compelling evidence comes from studies on the 17q21 locus. The risk conferred by specific variants in this region is dramatically amplified in children who experience viral respiratory infections (especially rhinovirus) in early life or who are exposed to certain environmental allergens.[19] Conversely, protective exposures, such as growing up on a traditional farm with its associated microbial diversity, can mitigate the genetic risk, likely through immune-modulatory effects that promote tolerance.[19] This dynamic interaction illustrates that genetic risk is not deterministic but probabilistic, contingent on the child's environmental context.

Type 1 Diabetes: Autoimmunity with a Strong Genetic Footprint

T1D is an autoimmune disease resulting from the T-cell-mediated destruction of insulin-producing pancreatic β-cells. It has one of the highest heritabilities among complex diseases, with concordance rates in monozygotic twins approaching 50%.

- **The HLA Complex:** The major genetic contribution to T1D risk lies within the Human Leukocyte Antigen (HLA) region on chromosome 6, accounting for approximately 50% of the genetic susceptibility.[20] Specific HLA class II haplotypes (e.g., DR3-DQ2 and DR4-DQ8) confer high risk, while others (e.g., DR2-DQ6) are highly protective. The mechanism involves the presentation of autoantigens (like insulin, GAD65) to T-cells, shaping the autoimmune response.
- **Non-HLA Loci:** Beyond the HLA region, over 60 other susceptibility loci have been identified. These include genes central to immune regulation, such as:
    - *INS* (Insulin): Polymorphisms in the insulin gene promoter influence its expression in the thymus, which is critical for establishing central T-cell tolerance.
    - *PTPN22*: A variant in this gene, which encodes a lymphoid-specific phosphatase, alters T-cell and B-cell receptor signaling, lowering the threshold for autoimmune activation.
    - *IL2RA* (CD25): This gene encodes a subunit of the IL-2 receptor, and its variants affect regulatory T-cell function, a key cell type in maintaining immune tolerance.[20]
- **Environmental Triggers:** Despite the strong genetic predisposition, the rising incidence of T1D suggests a major role for environmental factors. Hypothesized triggers include viral infections (e.g., enteroviruses), dietary factors (e.g., early exposure to complex proteins), and the gut microbiome. The current model posits that in a genetically susceptible individual, an environmental trigger may initiate or accelerate the autoimmune process, leading to clinical diabetes.[21]

Childhood Obesity:

Childhood obesity is a global epidemic with severe health consequences. It is a quintessential complex trait where a polygenic predisposition is expressed in an environment of caloric abundance and sedentary behavior.

- **Polygenic Risk Scores (PRS):** GWAS for adult and childhood BMI have identified hundreds of common variants, each with a minuscule effect.[22] When combined into a polygenic risk score (PRS), these variants can identify children with a significantly elevated genetic liability for obesity. Children in the top decile of PRS are at a several-fold higher risk of severe obesity compared to those in the bottom decile.
- **Key Biological Pathways:** The implicated genes are not surprisingly involved in pathways regulating appetite, satiety, energy expenditure, and fat storage in the central nervous system (e.g., *MC4R*, *BDNF*, *FTO*). The *FTO* gene was the first robustly associated locus, and while its exact mechanism is complex, it appears to influence energy balance through hypothalamic regulation of appetite.[22]
- **Gene-Lifestyle Interaction:** The genetic risk for obesity is not a fixed destiny. Its expression is highly dependent on lifestyle. High levels of physical activity and healthy dietary patterns have been shown to attenuate the effect of a high genetic risk score on BMI.[23] This provides a powerful public health message: while we cannot change a child's genetic makeup, we can modify their environment to counteract genetic predispositions, making behavioral interventions especially critical for those identified with high polygenic risk.

The understanding of polygenic contributions to pediatric disease is moving from research to clinical applicability. Polygenic risk scores are being explored for risk stratification, potentially allowing for targeted screening and early intervention programs for children at highest genetic risk for diseases like T1D or obesity. Furthermore, by identifying the biological pathways disrupted by cumulative genetic risk, GWAS findings are revealing novel drug targets for common diseases, shifting the therapeutic paradigm from symptomatic relief to mechanism-based intervention.

Epigenetic Modifications and Their Role in Pediatric Disease Outcomes

The central dogma of genetics, which posits a linear flow of information from DNA to RNA to protein, provides an essential but incomplete picture of phenotypic determination. Sitting atop the genomic sequence is a complex layer of regulatory information known as the epigenome. Epigenetics refers to the study of heritable changes in gene expression that do not involve alterations to the underlying DNA sequence.[23] These modifications create a dynamic interface between the static genome and the changing environment, effectively translating environmental exposures into stable changes in cellular function. The principal epigenetic mechanisms include DNA methylation, histone modifications, and non-coding RNA-associated gene silencing. In pediatrics, the epigenome is of paramount importance because it is particularly plastic during critical windows of development—from gametogenesis through fetal life and early childhood—making it a key mediator of developmental programming and a significant factor in disease vulnerability.[24]

A clear understanding of the core epigenetic players is crucial for appreciating their role in disease.

- **DNA Methylation:** This process involves the addition of a methyl group to the 5' position of a cytosine base, typically within a CpG dinucleotide context. Dense clusters of CpG sites, known as CpG islands, are often found in gene promoter regions. Hypermethylation of these promoters is generally associated with transcriptional repression by physically preventing transcription factors from binding and by recruiting methyl-binding proteins that condense chromatin. Conversely, hypomethylation of gene bodies or enhancer elements can facilitate gene activation.[25] DNA methylation is the most extensively studied epigenetic mark in human disease.
- **Histone Modifications:** DNA in the nucleus is wrapped around histone proteins to form chromatin. The N-terminal tails of these histones can undergo a wide array of post-translational modifications, including acetylation, methylation, phosphorylation, and ubiquitination. The specific combination of these marks constitutes the "histone code," which dictates whether a chromosomal region is in an open, transcriptionally active state (euchromatin) or a closed, transcriptionally silent state (heterochromatin). For instance, histone acetylation generally loosens chromatin and promotes gene expression, while certain types of histone methylation (e.g., H3K27me3) are repressive.[26]
- **Non-Coding RNAs:** This class of RNA molecules, which are not translated into protein, play a significant role in epigenetic regulation. MicroRNAs (miRNAs) and long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs) can influence gene expression by targeting mRNA transcripts for degradation or by blocking their translation. Additionally, some lncRNAs are involved in recruiting chromatin-modifying complexes to specific genomic loci, thereby initiating repressive epigenetic states.[27]

The DOHaD hypothesis posits that environmental exposures during critical periods of early development can program an individual's risk for chronic diseases in later life. Epigenetic mechanisms are the leading molecular candidates for this programming.[24]

- **Prenatal Nutritional Exposure:** The most compelling evidence comes from studies of individuals prenatally exposed to the Dutch Hunger Winter of 1944-45. Six decades later, individuals who were conceived during the famine exhibited persistent hypomethylation of the imprinted *IGF2* gene compared to their unexposed same-sex siblings.[28] *IGF2* is a key gene in growth and metabolism, and its altered methylation state is associated with an increased risk of metabolic syndrome, obesity, and cardiovascular disease in adulthood. This demonstrates that a transient nutritional insult in utero can engrave a permanent epigenetic mark with lifelong health consequences.
- **Maternal Stress and Mental Health:** The fetal environment is also shaped by maternal psychological states. Prenatal exposure to maternal stress, anxiety, or depression has been associated with altered DNA methylation in genes regulating the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis in offspring, such as the glucocorticoid receptor gene (*NR3C1*).[29] Hypermethylation of the *NR3C1* promoter in the hippocampus can lead to dysregulated cortisol signaling and an exaggerated stress response in the child, increasing vulnerability to anxiety, depression, and behavioral disorders later in life.

The influence of epigenetics extends to a wide spectrum of childhood-onset conditions.

- **Pediatric Cancers:** Epigenetic dysregulation is a hallmark of many childhood cancers, sometimes acting as a driver event equivalent to genetic mutations. For example, in diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma (DIPG), a devastating pediatric brain tumor, recurrent somatic mutations in genes encoding histone H3.3 (e.g., H3K27M) are found in over 80% of cases.[25] This mutation creates a dominant-negative inhibitor that causes a global reduction of H3K27 methylation, profoundly disrupting the epigenetic landscape and driving oncogenic gene expression programs. Similarly, in Wilms' tumor and other embryonal cancers, hypermethylation and silencing of tumor suppressor genes are frequent events.
- **Neurodevelopmental Disorders:** Rett syndrome, previously discussed as an X-linked Mendelian disorder caused by mutations in *MECP2*, is fundamentally a disease of epigenetic dysregulation.[27] The MECP2 protein is a reader of DNA methylation, interpreting the epigenetic code and helping to silence target genes. Its loss-of-function leads to widespread transcriptional dysregulation, particularly in neurons, resulting in the severe neurological phenotype. Furthermore, studies of complex neurodevelopmental conditions like Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) have identified distinct DNA methylation signatures in the blood and brains of affected individuals, suggesting that epigenetic mechanisms may contribute to the disease's multifactorial etiology.[30]
- **Allergic Asthma:** The rising prevalence of asthma and other allergic diseases cannot be explained by genetics alone and is strongly linked to environmental and developmental factors. Epigenetic mechanisms provide a plausible link. For instance, children born to mothers who were exposed to farm environments during pregnancy—a known protective factor for allergy—show distinct DNA methylation patterns in immune-related genes like *ORMDL1* and *STAT6* in cord blood mononuclear cells.[26] These epigenetic changes are associated with a more robust and balanced immune response, skewing away from the Th2-dominant phenotype that characterizes allergic asthma.

The reversible nature of epigenetic marks opens up exciting avenues for clinical translation in pediatrics.

- **Biomarkers for Early Risk Stratification:** Epigenetic signatures, particularly in easily accessible tissues like blood, hold promise as predictive biomarkers. A specific DNA methylation profile at birth could potentially identify infants at the highest risk for developing obesity, metabolic disease, or atopy, allowing for the initiation of targeted, pre-emptive lifestyle or environmental interventions before the onset of clinical disease.[29]
- **Epigenetic-Targeted Therapies:** The development of "epi-drugs" is a rapidly advancing field in oncology. Drugs that inhibit DNA methyltransferases (e.g., azacitidine) or histone deacetylases (HDACs) are already in clinical use for certain hematologic malignancies and are being investigated for pediatric solid tumors.[25] These agents can reverse aberrant epigenetic silencing of tumor suppressor genes, restoring normal cellular control mechanisms.
- **Lifestyle and Environmental Interventions:** Perhaps the most empowering implication is that positive environmental changes can induce beneficial epigenetic modifications. Improved nutrition, physical activity, reduced exposure to toxins, and enrichment of the early psychosocial environment have all been shown to favorably alter the epigenome.[23],[29] This positions epigenetics not as a deterministic life sentence but as a dynamic system that can be modulated to improve child health outcomes.

Genetic Testing and Counseling:

The advent of high-throughput genomic sequencing technologies, such as clinical exome sequencing (CES) and genome sequencing (GS), has revolutionized the diagnostic odyssey for children with rare and undiagnosed genetic diseases.[6],[30] These tools have dramatically increased diagnostic yields from approximately 5-10% with traditional methods to over 40% for selected cohorts, providing answers to families after years of uncertainty.[6] However, this powerful diagnostic capability brings forth a complex array of ethical, legal, and social implications (ELSI). The very nature of genetic information—being predictive, familial, and potentially stigmatizing—necessitates a rigorous framework for its responsible application in pediatric practice. Genetic counseling, therefore, is not an ancillary service but an integral and indispensable component of the genomic medicine care pathway, ensuring that the pursuit of a diagnosis is balanced with respect for patient autonomy, privacy, and psychosocial well-being.[31]

Genetic testing in children is employed across a wide clinical spectrum, each with distinct indications and ethical considerations.

- **Diagnostic Testing:** This is the most common indication, used to identify the genetic etiology of a child's presenting symptoms (e.g., global developmental delay, multiple congenital anomalies, or a suspected metabolic disorder). The primary

ethical imperative here is to act in the child's best interest, with the goal of effectively concluding the diagnostic odyssey, guiding management, and informing prognosis.[32]

- **Carrier Screening:** This testing identifies individuals who carry one copy of a gene mutation for an autosomal recessive or X-linked disorder. While typically offered to adults for reproductive planning, it can be identified incidentally in a child during diagnostic testing. The ethical challenge lies in deciding when and how to disclose this information, as it has no immediate health implications for the child but significant implications for future reproductive decisions of the parents and, eventually, the child themselves.[33]
- **Predictive and Pre-symptomatic Testing:** This refers to testing an asymptomatic child for a late-onset condition for which there is a known family history (e.g., Huntington disease, hereditary cancer syndromes). Most international guidelines strongly recommend deferring such testing until the child reaches the age of maturity and can provide autonomous consent, unless there is a clear medical benefit to childhood intervention.[34] Testing a child for an adult-onset condition removes their future autonomy to decide whether to know their genetic status.
- **Newborn Screening (NBS):** This is a public health program that tests newborns for a panel of serious but treatable conditions (e.g., phenylketonuria (PKU), congenital hypothyroidism, spinal muscular atrophy). NBS is justified by the principle of beneficence, as early detection and intervention can prevent severe disability or death. It operates under a model of implied consent for the public good, though ethical debates continue regarding the expansion of NBS to include conditions with less clear therapeutic protocols.[35]
- **Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing (NIPT) and Prenatal Diagnosis:** While occurring before birth, the results of these tests directly impact pediatric care. NIPT, which analyzes cell-free fetal DNA in maternal blood, can screen for common aneuploidies with high accuracy. The ethical considerations involve the potential for sex selection and the societal implications of widespread testing for non-medical traits.[36]

The application of genetic testing in children is guided by several key ethical principles.

- **Best Interest of the Child:** This is the paramount principle. Any genetic test should be performed with the intention of providing a clear medical benefit to the child, such as establishing a diagnosis that leads to a specific treatment, preventing serious harm, or ending a protracted and stressful diagnostic journey.[32]
- **Autonomy and Assent:** Young children cannot provide informed consent. Therefore, parents or guardians provide proxy consent. However, as a child matures, their developing autonomy should be respected. For older children and adolescents, the concept of "assent"—a knowing agreement to proceed—should be sought. The process should be developmentally appropriate, explaining the test, its potential outcomes, and what it might mean for them in terms they can understand.[37]
- **Privacy and Confidentiality:** Genetic information is uniquely identifiable and carries implications for biological relatives. Protecting the confidentiality of a child's genetic data is crucial. This includes securing databases and being judicious about what information is entered into the electronic health record, where access may be broad. The question of whether parents, as proxy decision-makers, have a right to access all of their child's raw genomic data is a subject of ongoing debate.[31]
- **Duty to Reanalyze and Disclose:** A single genomic test is not a static event. As knowledge evolves, a variant of uncertain significance (VUS) today may be reclassified as pathogenic tomorrow. This creates an ethical "duty to reanalyze" data and a subsequent challenge of how and when to re-contact families with updated results. Laboratories and clinical services are still developing sustainable frameworks for managing this ongoing responsibility.[38]

Genetic counseling is the process that navigates the clinical, ethical, and psychosocial dimensions of genetic testing.

- **Pre-test Counseling:** This session is essential for establishing realistic expectations and ensuring truly informed consent. The counselor should discuss:
  - The specific test being ordered and its technical limitations.
  - The possible outcomes: a positive diagnosis, a negative/uninformative result, or the finding of a VUS.
  - The concept of incidental or secondary findings—genetic information unrelated to the initial reason for testing but that may have health implications (e.g., a BRCA1 mutation found during a neurodevelopmental workup).
  - The implications for the child and the wider family.

- The policies regarding data storage and future use.[31],[37]

- **Post-test Counseling:** This involves returning the results in a clear and empathetic manner. For a positive diagnosis, the counselor explains the condition, its inheritance pattern, the prognosis, and available management options. For a VUS, it is critical to emphasize the uncertainty and that the result should not be used for clinical decision-making. The psychological impact of the result, whether positive or negative, must be addressed, and appropriate psychosocial support should be offered.[37]

Ethical Dilemmas in the Genomic Era

- **Incidental Findings (IFs) and Secondary Findings:** The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) has established a list of genes where known pathogenic variants should be reported back to patients, even if unrelated to the test indication, because they are associated with actionable adult-onset conditions (e.g., hereditary cancer and cardiac syndromes).[38] In pediatrics, this creates a conflict between the parents' right to know information that may affect their own health and the child's right to an "open future," free of knowledge about adult-onset conditions for which no childhood intervention exists. Current guidelines support the return of such secondary findings in children, arguing that the benefit to the parents' health outweighs the theoretical harm to the child's autonomy.[34],[38]

- **Direct-to-Consumer (DTC) Testing:** The proliferation of DTC genetic tests poses a significant challenge. Parents may obtain genetic information about their child outside of a clinical context, without pre-test counseling. This can lead to misinterpretation of risk, unnecessary anxiety, and inappropriate medical actions based on raw data or recreational traits. Pediatricians must be prepared to counsel families on the limitations and risks of DTC testing and to manage the fallout when such results are brought into the clinic.[33]

- **Implications for Family Planning:** A genetic diagnosis in a child has immediate implications for the parents' reproductive choices. It allows for informed decision-making, which may include prenatal diagnosis in future pregnancies, preimplantation genetic testing (PGT), or the use of donor gametes. Genetic counseling is essential to provide non-directive, accurate information about these options and to support the family through the complex emotional and ethical decisions involved.[36]

Challenges and Ethical Responsibilities

The clinical translation of this knowledge through genomic technologies like exome and genome sequencing has ended the diagnostic odyssey for countless families and is progressively informing targeted management. However, this powerful capability carries a profound responsibility. The ethical complexities of pediatric genetic testing—from managing incidental findings and variants of uncertain significance to preserving a child's future autonomy—demand that genetic counseling be an inseparable and non-negotiable component of the clinical workflow. The principles of beneficence, justice, and respect for autonomy must guide the application of these technologies.

CONCLUSION

The field of pediatric genetics has fundamentally evolved beyond the study of rare, classic syndromes to redefine the understanding of health and disease in children. Genetic factors are now recognized as central, dynamic forces that interact profoundly with the environment from conception to shape an individual's entire health trajectory. This is evident across the spectrum of disorders, from high-penetrance mutations in Mendelian conditions like cystic fibrosis and neurofibromatosis type 1, to the cumulative burden of common variants predisposing children to multifactorial diseases such as asthma, diabetes, and obesity. Furthermore, the elucidation of the epigenetic layer of regulation has provided a crucial mechanistic bridge between the genome and the environment, supporting the Developmental Origins of Health and Disease (DOHaD) hypothesis by demonstrating how early life exposures program long-term health outcomes.

DECLARATIONS

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate
Not applicable. This study is a review article and did not involve any direct contact with human or animal subjects.

Consent for Publication
Not applicable.

Competing Interests
The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding
This research received no external funding.

Data Availability
Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Author Contributions
All authors contributed equally to the conceptualization,

methodology, writing, and final review of this manuscript.

Acknowledgments
Not applicable.

REFERENCES

1. Es L. Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. nature. 2001;409:860-921.
2. Bruni O, Breda M, Mammarella V, Mogavero MP, Ferri R. Sleep and circadian disturbances in children with neurodevelopmental disorders. Nature Reviews Neurology. 2025 Feb;21(2):103-20
3. Dolk H, Loane M, Garne E. The prevalence of congenital anomalies in Europe. Rare diseases epidemiology. 2010:349-64.
4. Wang X, Tse C, Singh A. Discovery and development of CFTR modulators for the treatment of cystic fibrosis. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry. 2025 Jan 30;68(3):2255-300.
5. Luo H, Liu Y, Wei C, Xiong H. RNA sequencing facilitates the identification of genetic causes of Duchenne muscular dystrophy and proposes a stepwise DMD diagnostic procedure. Gene. 2025 Feb 5;936:149089.
6. Yang Y, Muzny DM, Reid JG, Bainbridge MN, Willis A, Ward PA, Braxton A, Beuten J, Xia F, Niu Z, Hardison M. Clinical whole-exome sequencing for the diagnosis of mendelian disorders. New England Journal of Medicine. 2013 Oct 17;369(16):1502-11.
7. Visscher PM, Wray NR, Zhang Q, Sklar P, McCarthy MI, Brown MA, Yang J. 10 years of GWAS discovery: biology, function, and translation. The American Journal of Human Genetics. 2017 Jul 6;101(1):5-22.
8. MacArthur J, Bowler E, Cerezo M, Gil L, Hall P, Hastings E, Junkins H, McMahon A, Milano A, Morales J, Pendlington ZM. The new NHGRI-EBI Catalog of published genome-wide association studies (GWAS Catalog). Nucleic acids research. 2017 Jan 4;45(D1):D896-901.
9. Acuna-Hidalgo R, Veltman JA, Hoischen A. New insights into the generation and role of de novo mutations in health and disease. Genome biology. 2016 Nov 28;17(1):241.
10. De Boeck K, Amaral MD. Progress in therapies for cystic fibrosis. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2016 Aug 1;4(8):662-74.
11. Piel FB, Steinberg MH, Rees DC. Sickle cell disease. New England Journal of Medicine. 2017 Apr 20;376(16):1561-73.
12. Gutmann DH, Ferner RE, Listernick RH, Korf BR, Wolters PL, Johnson KJ. Neurofibromatosis type 1. Nature Reviews Disease Primers. 2017 Feb 23;3(1):1-7.
13. Milewicz DM, Braverman AC, De Backer J, Morris SA, Boileau C, Maumenee IH, Jondeau G, Evangelista A, Pyeritz RE. Marfan syndrome. Nature reviews Disease primers. 2021 Sep 2;7(1):64.
14. Bladen CL, Salgado D, Monges S, Foncuberta ME, Kekou K, Kosma K, Dawkins H, Lamont L, Roy AJ, Chamova T, Guergueltcheva V. The TREAT-NMD DMD Global Database: analysis of more than 7,000 Duchenne muscular dystrophy mutations. Human mutation. 2015 Apr;36(4):395-402.
15. Horton WA, Hall JG, Hecht JT. Achondroplasia. The Lancet. 2007 Jul 14;370(9582):162-72.
16. Angulo MA, Butler MG, Cataletto ME. Prader-Willi syndrome: a review of clinical, genetic, and endocrine findings. Journal of endocrinological investigation. 2015 Dec;38(12):1249-63.
17. Visscher PM, Wray NR, Zhang Q, Sklar P, McCarthy MI, Brown MA, Yang J. 10 years of GWAS discovery: biology, function, and translation. The American Journal of Human Genetics. 2017 Jul 6;101(1):5-22.
18. Pividori M, Schoettler N, Nicolae DL, Ober C, Im HK. Shared and distinct genetic risk factors for childhood-onset and adult-onset asthma: genome-wide and transcriptome-wide studies. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2019 Jun 1;7(6):509-22.
19. Bønnelykke K, Sleiman P, Nielsen K, Kreiner-Møller E, Mercader JM, Belgrave D, Den Dekker HT, Husby A, Sevelsted A, Faura-Tellez G, Mortensen LJ. A genome-wide association study identifies CDHR3 as a susceptibility locus for early childhood asthma with severe exacerbations. Nature genetics. 2014 Jan;46(1):51-5.
20. Pociot F, Lernmark Å. Genetic risk factors for type 1 diabetes. The Lancet. 2016 Jun 4;387(10035):2331-9.
21. Ilonen J, Lempainen J, Veijola R. The heterogeneous pathogenesis of type 1 diabetes mellitus. Nature Reviews Endocrinology. 2019 Nov;15(11):635-50.
22. Loos RJ, Yeo GS. The genetics of obesity: from discovery to biology. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2022 Feb;23(2):120-33.
23. Li S, Zhao JH, Luan JA, Ekelund U, Luben RN, Khaw KT, Wareham NJ, Loos RJ. Physical activity attenuates the genetic predisposition to obesity in 20,000 men and women from EPIC-Norfolk prospective population study. PLoS medicine. 2010 Aug 31;7(8):e1000332.
24. Heijmans BT, Tobi EW, Stein AD, Putter H, Blauw GJ, Susser ES, Slagboom PE, Lumey LH. Persistent epigenetic differences associated with prenatal exposure to famine in humans. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2008 Nov 4;105(44):17046-9.
25. Sturm D, Witt H, Hovestadt V, Khuong-Quang DA, Jones DT, Konermann C, Pfaff E, Tönjes M, Sill M, Bender S, Kool M. Hotspot mutations in H3F3A and IDH1 define distinct epigenetic and biological subgro
26. Michel S, Busato F, Genuneit J, Pekkanen J, Dalphin JC, Riedler J, Mazaleyrat N, Weber J, Karvonen AM, Hirvonen MR, Braun-Fahrländer C. Farm exposure and time trends in early childhood may influence DNA methylation in genes related to asthma and allergy. Allergy. 2013 Mar;68(3):355-64.
27. Amir RE, Van den Veyver IB, Wan M, Tran CQ, Francke U, Zoghbi HY. Rett syndrome is caused by mutations in X-linked MECP2, encoding methyl-CpG-binding protein 2. Nature genetics. 1999 Oct;23(2):185-8. Replace with a more updated/recent reference and change the relevant/corresponding data accordingly.
28. Tobi EW, Slieker RC, Luijk R, Dekkers KF, Stein AD, Xu KM, Biobank-based Integrative Omics Studies Consortium, Slagboom PE, van Zwet EW, Lumey LH,

Heijmans BT. DNA methylation as a mediator of the association between prenatal adversity and risk factors for metabolic disease in adulthood. Science advances. 2018 Jan 31;4(1):eaao4364.
29. Oberlander TF, Weinberg J, Papsdorf M, Grunau R, Misri S, Devlin AM. Prenatal exposure to maternal depression, neonatal methylation of human glucocorticoid receptor gene (NR3C1) and infant cortisol stress responses. Epigenetics. 2008 Mar 24;3(2):97-106.
30. Ladd-Acosta C, Hansen KD, Briem E, Fallin MD, Kaufmann WE, Feinberg AP. Common DNA methylation alterations in multiple brain regions in autism. Molecular psychiatry. 2014 Aug;19(8):862-71.
31. Botkin JR, Belmont JW, Berg JS, Berkman BE, Bombard Y, Holm IA, Levy HP, Ormond KE, Saal HM, Spinner NB, Wilfond BS. Points to consider: ethical, legal, and psychosocial implications of genetic testing in children and adolescents. The American Journal of Human Genetics. 2015 Jul 2;97(1):6-21.
32. Ross LF, Saal HM, David KL, Anderson RR. Technical report: ethical and policy issues in genetic testing and screening of children. Genetics in medicine. 2013 Mar;15(3):234-45.
33. Howard HC, Borry P, Knoppers BM. Blurring lines: The research activities of direct-to-consumer genetic testing companies raise questions about consumers as research subjects. EMBO reports. 2010 Aug 1;11(8):579-82.
34. MacLeod R, Tibben A, Frontali M, Evers-Kiebooms G, Jones A, Martinez-Descales A, Roos RA, Editorial Committee and Working Group 'Genetic Testing Counselling'of the European Huntington Disease Network. Recommendations for the predictive genetic test in Huntington's disease. Clinical genetics. 2013 Mar;83(3):221-31.
35. Lantos JD. Ethical and psychosocial issues in whole-genome sequencing for newborns. Clinical applications for next-generation sequencing. 2016 Jan 1:295-300.
36. Gregg AR, Skotko BG, Benkendorf JL, Monaghan KG, Bajaj K, Best RG, Klugman S, Watson MS, ACMG Noninvasive Prenatal Screening Work Group. Noninvasive prenatal screening for fetal aneuploidy, 2016 update: a position statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics. Genetics in medicine. 2016 Oct 1;18(10):1056-65.
37. Riley BD, Culver JO, Skrzynia C, Senter LA, Peters JA, Costalas JW, Callif-Daley F, Grumet SC, Hunt KS, Nagy RS, McKinnon WC. Essential elements of genetic cancer risk assessment, counseling, and testing: updated recommendations of the National Society of Genetic Counselors. Journal of genetic counseling. 2012 Apr;21(2):151-61.
38. Kalia SS, Adelman K, Bale SJ, Chung WK, Eng C, Evans JP, Herman GE, Hufnagel SB, Klein TE, Korf BR, McKelvey KD. Recommendations for reporting of secondary findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing, 2016 update (ACMG SF v2. 0): a policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics. Genetics in medicine. 2017 Feb;19(2):249-55.